

## **REMARKS**

In response to the above-identified Office Action, the Applicants submit the above amendments and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks below. Claims 1-28 are amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-28 are pending in the application.

### **I. Objections to the Drawings**

The Applicants submit herewith a set of amended drawings for Figures 1-4. The Applicants have revised each of the figures to more clearly utilize reference characters. The Applicants have also submitted herewith a substitute specification in an endeavor to address each of the objections of the Examiner related to the duplicative use of various reference characters in multiple figures and inconsistent use of the reference signs in the specification and the figures. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings are requested.

### **II. Objections to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-28 as containing informalities. The Applicants have revised the claims to address the informalities noted by the Examiner. The Applicants have reviewed each of the objections noted by the Examiner and the Applicants have addressed each of them in addition to other informalities noted by the Applicants. The Applicants have endeavored to put the claims in better condition by revising them to utilize more consistent terminology and to make the relationship of the elements of the claims more clear. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of objections to the claims are requested.

### **III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 3, 12, 16, 17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite.

In regard to claims 12 and 26, these claims are rejected for including elements that lack antecedent basis. The Applicants have revised these claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claims 12 and 26 are requested.

In regard to claims 2, 3, 16 and 17, these claims have been rejected for using the term "expecting" and "expected confirmation." The Applicants have endeavored to revise these claims in light of the suggestions provided by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of these claims are requested.

### **IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has objected to each of the claims as allegedly failing to meet the requirements of the machine-or-transformation test. The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14 to more clearly tie them to a machine. In regard to claim 28, the Applicants have amended the preamble to indicate that it is a non-transitory storage medium in light of the Examiner's suggestions. The Applicants have also corrected the typo in the preamble. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the non-statutory subject matter rejection of claims 1-28 are requested.

**V. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4-9, 13-15, 18-23, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,991,536 by Brodsky, *et al.* (hereinafter “Brodsky”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0015441 by Attwood, *et al.* (hereinafter “Attwood”).

To establish obviousness, the Examiner must show the cited references, combined, render each of the claims obvious. In regard to claim 1, this claim includes the elements of “upon receipt of the notification, requesting changed data from the data object.” The Examiner cites col. 4, lines 51-53 and col. 3, lines 31-34 of Brodsky as teaching this element of claim 1. However, the cited sections indicate that the notification manager of Brodsky interacts with the object hierarchy and not the observed object to obtain information regarding the changes to the observed object. The Examiner has equated the observed object of Brodsky with the data object recited in this element of claim 1. Thus, the Examiner has not shown that Brodsky discloses this element of claim 1.

Claim 1 also includes the elements of “checking, by an agent executed by a computer system, a plurality of entries representative of a plurality of applications maintained by the agent to determine whether the changed data is relevant for each application in the plurality of applications.” The Examiner cites col. 14, lines 51-55 and col. 5, lines 2 and 3 and col. 4, lines 54-57 as disclosing these elements of claim 1. However, the cited sections disclose a system where a function of the observed object is used to notify observer objects based on the observer objects being directly registered with the observed object. Thus, the notification manager of Brodsky, which the Examiner has equated with the agent, does not perform a check of all registered applications with the agent. Therefore, this claim is not obvious over Brodsky. The Examiner has not indicated and the Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Attwood

that cures the above-mentioned defects of Brodsky. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 1 are requested.

In regard to independent claims 14 and 28, these claims include elements analogous to those of independent claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claim 1, these claims are not obvious over Brodsky in view of Attwood. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

In regard to claims 4-9, 13, 15, 18-23 and 27, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 14, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claims 1 and 14, these claims are not obvious over Brodsky in view of Attwood. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 2, 3, 10-12, 16, 17 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Attwood and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,205 by Reed, *et al.* (hereinafter "Reed").

These claims depend from independent claims 1 and 14 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claims 1 and 14, these claims are not obvious over Brodsky in view of Attwood. Further, the Examiner has not relied upon and the Applicants have been unable to discern any part of Reed that cures the above-mentioned defects of Brodsky and Attwood. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

### CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: 4/21, 2010

  
Jonathan S. Miller Reg. No. 48,534

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(310) 207-3800

### CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on 4-21, 2010.

  
Melissa Stead 4-21, 2010